REPRESENTATIVE DISTRICTS

(Apportionment Plan - 1992)

House District 1	House District 6
Total Population (1990)	Total Population (1990) 82,732 Non-Hispanic Black Population 56,842 Hispanic Population 869
Geographic Description Wayne County (part) Grosse Pointe City Grosse Pointe Township Grosse Pointe Farms City Grosse Pointe Park City Grosse Pointe Woods City Harper Woods City	Geographic Description Wayne County (part) Hamtramck City Highland Park City Detroit City (part) Tracts: 5071-5079, 5104, 5105, 5301
Detroit City (part) Tracts: 5014-5018	House District 7
House District 2	Total Population (1990) 82,977 Non-Hispanic Black Population 68,790 Hispanic Population 1,460
Total Population (1990) 81,492 Non-Hispanic Black Population 52,722 Hispanic Population 720 Geographic Description Wayne County (part) Detroit City (part) Tracts: 5001-5013, 5039-5043, 5121, 5516	Geographic Description Wayne County (part) Detroit City (part) Tracts: 5170-5174, 5176, 5201-5209, 5213-5215, 5218-5224, 5322-5327, 5330, 5331, 5333, 5312, 5313, 5317-5319
House District 3	House District 8
Total Population (1990) 82,454 Non-Hispanic Black Population 72,918 Hispanic Population 470	Total Population (1990) 81,225 Non-Hispanic Black Population 25,696 Hispanic Population 16,717
Geographic Description Wayne County (part) Detroit City (part) Tracts: 5019, 5020, 5044, 5045, 5122-5124, 5126, 5129, 5132-5136, 5139-5143, 5145, 5146, 5149, 5150, 5153-5157, 5501, 5502	Geographic Description Wayne County (part) River Rouge City Detroit City (part) Tracts: 5211, 5212, 5231, 5252, 5254-5256, 5232-5238, 5240-5243, 5245, 5245.99, 5247, 5248, 5257, 5786, 5793
House District 4	House District 9
Total Population (1990) 80,416 Non-Hispanic Black Population 68,943 Hispanic Population 558 Geographic Description Wayne County (part) Detroit City (part) Tracts: 5046, 5047, 5107-5109, 5111-5117, 5147, 5148, 5151, 5152, 5161-5164, 5165.99, 5166-5169, 5175, 5177-5181, 5183-5188, 5102, 5103, 5106, 5165	Total Population (1990)
House District 5	House District 10
Total Population (1990)81,775Non-Hispanic Black Population57,255Hispanic Population735	Total Population (1990) 80,748 Non-Hispanic Black Population 74,513 Hispanic Population 567
Geographic Description Wayne County (part) Detroit City (part) Tracts: 5048, 5052, 5053, 5031-5037, 5049-5051, 5061-5070	Geographic Description Wayne County (part) Detroit City (part) Tracts: 5080, 5302, 5303, 5361-5364, 5367, 5368, 5381-5392

House District 11	House District 17
Total Population (1990) 84,357 Non-Hispanic Black Population 67,242 Hispanic Population 1,075 Geographic Description Wayne County (part) Detroit City (part) Tracts: 5342-5344, 5347, 5350-5352, 5355, 5356, 5357, 5365, 5366, 5370-5372, 5377, 5378, 5454-5458	Total Population (1990) 86,251 Non-Hispanic Black Population 22,285 Hispanic Population 1,313 Geographic Description Wayne County (part) Garden City City Inkster City Wayne City Westland (part) Tracts: 5688-5690
House District 12	
Total Population (1990)	House District 18 Total Population (1990) 86,293 Non-Hispanic Black Population 1,442 Hispanic Population 1,615 Geographic Description Wayne County (part) Canton Township (part) Tracts: 5632, 5640 Westland (part) Tracts: 5671-5687
House District 13	
Total Population (1990) 80,119 Non-Hispanic Black Population 57,645 Hispanic Population 1,127 Geographic Description Wayne County (part) Detroit City (part) Tracts: 5353, 5354, 5373, 5424, 5426-5428, 5439, 5451-5453, 5459-5469, 5440 House District 14 Total Population (1990) 79,577 Non-Hispanic Black Population 54,247 Hispanic Population 839 Geographic Description Wayne County (part) Detroit City (part) Tracts: 5406-5415, 5417, 5418, 5432, 5434-5438, 5441-5443 House District 15 Total Population (1990) 89,286 Non-Hispanic Black Population 490 Hispanic Population 2,483	## House District 19 Total Population (1990) 90,576 Non-Hispanic Black Population 258 Hispanic Population 1,219 Geographic Description Wayne County (part)
Geographic Description Wayne County (part) Dearborn City	
House District 16 Total Population (1990) 88,862 Non-Hispanic Black Population 537 Hispanic Population 1,878 Geographic Description Wayne County (part) Dearborn Heights City Redford Township (part) Tracts: 5547-5556	House District 21 Total Population (1990)

House District 22		House District 27	
Total Population (1990) Non-Hispanic Black Population Hispanic Population Geographic Description Wayne County (part) Romulus City Taylor City (part) Tracts: 5830-5845, 5848	88,338 7,668 2,259	Total Population (1990) Non-Hispanic Black Population Hispanic Population Geographic Description Macomb County (part) East Detroit City Roseville City St. Clair Shores City (part)	89,993 692 931
		Tracts: 2503, 2550	
House District 23			
Total Population (1990) Non-Hispanic Black Population Hispanic Population Geographic Description Wayne County (part)	91,354 952 1,796	House District 28 Total Population (1990)	90,212 902 1,193
Brownstown Township Flat Rock City Gibraltar City Grosse Ile Township Huron Township Rockwood City Trenton City Woodhaven City		Geographic Description Macomb County (part) Center Line City Warren City (part) Tracts: 2619, 2621-2642	
Taylor City (part)		House District 29	
Tracts: 5846, 5847, 5915		Total Population (1990) Non-Hispanic Black Population Hispanic Population	91,368 286 766
House District 24		Geographic Description	
Total Population (1990)	84,066 600 1,973	Macomb County (part) Sterling Heights (part) Tracts: 2318-2323 Warren City (part)	
Geographic Description Wayne County (part) Riverview City Southgate City Winestern City		Tracts: 2600-2618, 2620, 2676	
Wyandotte City Allen Park (part)		House District 30	00.120
Tracts: 5766, 5767		Total Population (1990) Non-Hispanic Black Population Hispanic Population	90,120 382 1,030
House District 25		Geographic Description Macomb County (part)	
Total Population (1990)	87,857 5,595 3,776	Sterling Heights (part) Tracts: 2300-2317, 2324, 2256, 2257	
Geographic Description Wayne County (part)			
Ecorse City		House District 31	
Lincoln Park City Melvindale City Allen Park City (part) Tracts: 5729, 5742, 5756, 5760-5765,	5785,	Total Population (1990)	89,491 5,671 1,204
5786		Macomb County (part) Fraser City Mount Clemens City	
House District 26		Clinton Township (part)	2/52
Total Population (1990)	89,599 537 988	Tracts: 2400, 2405, 2407-2418, 2450, 2453	2452,
Geographic Description			
Macomb County (part) Harrison Township		House District 32	00.:-
Lake Township St. Clair Shores City (part) Tracts: 2500-2502, 2504-2522		Total Population (1990) Non-Hispanic Black Population Hispanic Population	88,121 460 906

House District 32 (Cont.)	1	House District 37	
Geographic Description Macomb County (part) Armada Township		Total Population (1990)	84,784 1,499 965
Bruce Township Memphis City Ray Township Richmond City Richmond Township Shelby Township Utica City Washington Township		Geographic Description Oakland County (part) Farmington City Farmington Hills City	
wasangton rownsap		House District 38	
House District 33		Total Population (1990)	78,771 315 782
Total Population (1990)	88,496 1,383 960	Geographic Description Oakland County (part) Lyon Township Millord Township	
Geographic Description Macomb County (part) Chesterfield Township Lenox Township Macomb Township New Baltimore City Clinton Township (part) Tracts: 2401-2404, 2406		Milford Township Northville City Novi City Novi Township South Lyon City Walled Lake City Wixom City	
		House District 39	
House District 34	00.071	Total Population (1990)	86,689 1,158
Total Population (1990) Non-Hispanic Black Population Hispanic Population Geographic Description Oakland County (part) Hazel Park City Madison Heights City Royal Oak City (part) Tracts: 1839-1847	80,071 453 980	Hispanic Population Geographic Description Oakland County (part) Commerce Township Orchard Lake Village City West Bloomfield Township Keego Harbor City	1,027
		House District 40	
House District 35 Total Population (1990) Non-Hispanic Black Population Hispanic Population	86,711 14,070 1,200	Total Population (1990) Non-Hispanic Black Population Hispanic Population Geographic Description Oakland County (part)	82,897 1,345 925
Geographic Description Oakland County (part) Berkley City Ferndale City Huntington Woods City Oak Park City Pleasant Ridge City Royal Oak Township		Birmingham City Bloomfield Township Bloomfield Hills City Southfield Township Sylvan Lake City	
		House District 41	
		Total Population (1990)	82,241 740
House District 36		Hispanic Population	919
House District 36 Total Population (1990) Non-Hispanic Black Population Hispanic Population	80,057 22,857 1,351	Hispanic Population	919

House District 42		House District 47	
Total Population (1990)	78,463 922 1,071	Total Population (1990) Non-Hispanic Black Population Hispanic Population	87,579 951 1,175
Geographic Description Oakland County (part) Rochester Hills City (part) Tracts: 1926, 1928, 1930, 1931, 1938, 1942, 1944, 1946 Troy City (part) Tracts: 1960-1965, 1970-1972	1940,	Geographic Description Genesee County (part) Atlas Township Clio City Davison City Davison Township Flushing City Flushing Township Forest Township Montrose City	
House District 43 Total Population (1990)	88,570 31,337 6,201	Montrose Township Richfield Township Thetford Township Vienna Township	
Geographic Description Oakland County (part)		H District 40	
Auburn Hills Ĉity Lake Angelus City Pontiac City		House District 48 Total Population (1990)	83,304 57,718 1,800
House District 44		Geographic Description Genesee County (part) Flint City (part)	
Total Population (1990)	89,300 846 1,832	Tracts: 1-14, 17, 103.04, 105.01, 108. Mount Morris Township	02
Geographic Description Oakland County (part) Waterford Township White Lake Township		House District 49 Total Population (1990)	82,655 17,594 3,033
House District 45		Geographic Description Genesee County (part)	3,433
Total Population (1990)	81,914 724 1,131	Flint City (part) Tracts: 15, 16, 18-41, 108.03, 109.04, 113.01, 120.01, 129.01	110,
Geographic Description Oakland County (part) Addison Township		House District 50	
Oakland Charter Township Orion Township Oxford Township Rochester City Rochester Hills City (part) Tracts: 1910, 1920, 1922, 1924, 1932,	1934	Total Population (1990) Non-Hispanic Black Population Hispanic Population Geographic Description Genesee County (part) Burton City Genesee Township Grand Blanc City	88,154 4,166 1,641
House District 46		Grand Blanc Township Mount Morris City	
Total Population (1990) Non-Hispanic Black Population Hispanic Population Geographic Description	83,124 535 1,246	House District 51	
Oakland County (part) Brandon Township Groveland Township Highland Township Holly Township Independence Township Rose Township Springfield Township		Total Population (1990) Non-Hispanic Black Population Hispanic Population Geographic Description Genesee County (part) Argentine Township Clayton Township Fenton City	88,767 2,918 1,228

House District 51 (Cont.)

Fenton Township Flint Township Gaines Township Linden City Mundy Township Swartz Creek City

House District 52

Total Population (1990)	82,601
Non-Hispanic Black Population	4,939
Hispanic Population	1,439

Geographic Description

Washtenaw County (part) Northfield Township Scio Township

Webster Township Dexter Township Lima Township

Lyndon Township Sylvan Township Ann Arbor (part)

Tracts: 4021-4028, 4031-4035, 4042, 4053, 4060, 4520

Ann Arbor Township (part)*

Tracts: 4022-4028, 4031, 4032, 4034, 4035, 4041, 4042, 4043 (part) Block 103B, 4053, 4060, 4070, 4510

House District 53

Total Population (1990)	84,543
Non-Hispanic Black Population	8,508
Hispanic Population	2,168

Geographic Description

Washtenaw County (part)

Ann Arbor (part)

Tracts: 6, 4001-4008, 4041, 4043-4046, 4051, 4052, 4054, 4055, 4142, 4146, 4148 Ann Arbor Township (part)**

Tracts: 4043 (part) Block 210B, 4045, 4046 Pittsfield Township

House District 54

Total Population (1990)	82,607
Non-Hispanic Black Population	16,848
Hispanic Population	1,345

Geographic Description

Washtenaw County (part) Salem Township Superior Township Ypsilanti City Ypsilanti Township

House District 55

Total Population (1990)	85,802
Non-Hispanic Black Population	
Hispanic Population	1,421

Geographic Description

Monroe County (part) Bedford Township Dundee Township

move or split. 413 Mich 96, 201.

See District 53. ** Three islands of Ann Arbor Township (one containing a population of 7) completely surrounded by Ann Arbor City and not a

House District 55 (Cont.)

Exeter Township Ida Township London Township Milan City Milan Township Petersburg City Summerfield Township Whiteford Township Washtenaw County (part) Augusta Township Bridgewater Township Freedom Township

Lodi Township Manchester Township Milan City Saline City Saline Township

Sharon Township York Township Lenawee County (part) Macon Township

House District 56

Total Population (1990)	82,405
Non-Hispanic Black Population	1,371
Hispanic Population	1.452

Geographic Description

Monroe County (part)

Ash Township Berlin Township

Erie Township

Frenchtown Township

La Salle Township

Luna Pier City

Monroe City

Monroe Township

Raisinville Township

House District 57

Total Population (1990)	90,055
Non-Hispanic Black Population	1,278
Hispanic Population	5,498

Geographic Description

Lenawee County (part)

Adrian City

Adrian Township

Blissfield Township

Cambridge Township Clinton Township

Deerfield Township

Dover Township

Fairfield Township

Franklin Township

Hudson City

Hudson Township

Madison Charter Township

Medina Township

Morenci City

Ogden Township

Palmyra Township

Raisin Township

Ridgeway Township

Riga Township

Rollin Township

314 CHAPTER III • THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

House District 57 (Cont.) Rome Township		House District 62 Total Population (1990)	88,082
Seneca Township Tecumseh City		Non-Hispanic Black Population Hispanic Population	10,856 1,437
Tecumseh Township Woodstock Township		Geographic Description Calhoun County (part) Battle Creek City	
House District 58		Bedford Township Emmet Township	
Total Population (1990)	84,933 799 863	Pennfield Township Springfield City	
Geographic Description			
Branch County Hillsdale County		House District 63	
		Total Population (1990)	89,129
House District 59		Non-Hispanic Black Population	3,835 1,528
Total Population (1990)	89,474	Geographic Description	
Non-Hispanic Black Population	3,205	Kalamazoo County (part)	
Hispanic Population	816	Brady Township Charleston Township	
Geographic Description St. Joseph County		Climax Township	
Cass County (part)		Comstock Township Galesburg City	
Calvin Township Howard Township		Pavilion Township	
Jefferson Township		Prairie Ronde Township Ross Township	
Marcellus Township Mason Township		Schoolcraft Township	
Milton Township		Wakeshma Township Calhoun County (part)	
Newberg Township Niles City		Albion City	
Ontwa Township		Albion Township Athens Township	
Penn Township Porter Township		Burlington Township	
rotter rownsinp		Clarence Township Clarendon Township	
House District 60		Convis Township	
Total Population (1990)	91,057	Eckford Township Fredonia Township	
Non-Hispanic Black Population	16,006	Homer Township	
Hispanic Population	2,455	Lee Township	
Geographic Description Kalamazoo County (part)		Leroy Township Marengo Township	
Kalamazoo City		Marshall City	
Kalamazoo Township (part) Tracts: 1, 14.01, 14.02, 18.03		Marshall Township Newton Township	
Parchment City		Sheridan Township	
Portage City (part)* Tract: 18.02		Tekonsha Township	
House District 61		House District 64	
Total Population (1990)	91.125	Total Population (1990)	79,068
Non-Hispanic Black Population	3,229	Non-Hispanic Black Population	11,327 1,599
Hispanic Population	1,113	Geographic Description	1,277
Geographic Description Kalamazoo County (part)		Jackson County (part)	
Kalamazoo Township (part)		Blackman Township Jackson City	
Tracts: 2.02, 15.01-15.03 Alamo Township		Summit Township	
Cooper Township			
Oshtemo Township Portage City (part)**			
Tracts: 19.02, 19.04-19.07, 20.01, 20.0	02,	House District 65	
21.01, 21.02		Total Population (1990)	77,734
Richland Township		Non-Hispanic Black Population	503

House District 65 (Cont.) Geographic Description Jackson County (part) Columbia Township Concord Township Grass Lake Township Hanover Township Henrietta Township Leoni Township Liberty Township Napoleon Township Norvell Township Parma Township Parma Township Parma Township Rives Township Sandstone Township Spring Arbor Township Springport Township Tompkins Township Waterloo Township Eaton County (part) Eaton Rapids City Hamlin Township		House District 67 (Cont.) White Oak Township Williamston City Williamstown Township Meridian Township (part) Tract: 48 House District 68 Total Population (1990) 78,656 Non-Hispanic Black Population 10,199 Hispanic Population 3,699 Geographic Description Ingham County (part) Lansing Township (part) Tracts: 17.01, 17.02, 34, 35 Alaiedon Township Aurelius Township Delhi Charter Township Lansing City (part) Tracts: 15, 17.01, 17.02, 19, 24-27, 34, 35, 36.01, 36.02, 37, 51, 52.01, 52.02,
House District 66 Total Population (1990) Non-Hispanic Black Population Hispanic Population Geographic Description Livingston County (part) Brighton City Brighton Township Genoa Township Green Oak Township Hamburg Township Hartland Township Howell City Marion Township Oceola Township	80,795 625 652	House District 69 Total Population (1990)
House District 67 Total Population (1990)	80,697 538 1,165	House District 70 Total Population (1990) 79,397 Non-Hispanic Black Population 4,631 Hispanic Population 1,871 Geographic Description Ingham County (part) East Lansing City Meridian Township (part) Tracts: 39.01, 39.02, 43.01, 43.02, 44.01, 45-47, 49.01, 49.02, 50.01, 50.02 House District 71 Total Population (1990) 85,833 Non-Hispanic Black Population 3,263 Hispanic Population 2,051 Geographic Description Eaton County (part) Bellevue Township Benton Township Carmel Township Carmel Township Charlotte City Chester Township Delta Township Eaton Township Eaton Township Eaton Township Eaton Township Eaton Township

House District 71 (Cont.)	1	House District 75	
Eaton Rapids Township Grand Ledge City Kalamo Township Lansing City Olivet City Oneida Charter Township		Total Population (1990) Non-Hispanic Black Population Hispanic Population Geographic Description Kent County (part)	83,203 18,153 1,766
Potterville City Roxand Township Sunfield Township Vermontville Township Walton Township		Grand Rapids City (part) Tracts: 3, 4, 10, 23, 24, 31, 32, 34, 35, 42-46, 118.01, 126.01, 11.02, 33, 118.02, 123, 142, 126.02	
Windsor Township		House District 76	
House District 72		Total Population (1990) Non-Hispanic Black Population Hispanic Population	84,032 9,536 4,212
Total Population (1990) Non-Hispanic Black Population Hispanic Population Geographic Description	84,717 2,482 1,198	Geographic Description Kent County (part) Grand Rapids City (part) Tracts: 1, 2, 5-9, 12-22, 25-30, 116	
Kent County (part)			
Byron Township Caledonia Township		House District 77	
Cascade Township Gaines Township Kentwood City		Total Population (1990)	85,782 8,290 5,650
		Geographic Description Kent County (part)	
House District 73		Grand Rapids City (part) Tracts: 36-41	
Total Population (1990) Non-Hispanic Black Population Hispanic Population	84,421 535 829	Wyoming City	
Geographic Description		House District 78 Total Population (1990)	80,393
Kent County (part) Ada Township Algoma Township		Non-Hispanic Black Population	4,421 1,638
Bowne Township Cannon Township East Grand Rapids City Grand Rapids Charter Township		Geographic Description Berrien County (part) Baroda Township	
Lowell City Lowell Township Plainfield Township		Berrien Township Bertrand Township Bridgman City	
Rockford City Vergennes Township		Buchanan City Buchanan Township Chikaming Township	
		Galien Township Lake Charter Township	
House District 74		New Buffalo City New Buffalo Township	
Total Population (1990)	450	Niles City Niles Township Oronoko Township	
Hispanic Population Geographic Description	1,079	Pipestone Township	
Kent County (part) Alpine Township Cedar Springs City Courtland Township Grandville City		Royalton Township Sodus Township Three Oaks Township Weesaw Township	
Grattan Township Nelson Township		House District 79	
Oakfield Township Solon Township		Total Population (1990)	80,985 20,267
Sparta Township		Hispanic Population	1,045
Spencer Township Tyrone Township		Geographic Description Berrien County (part)	
Walker City Ottawa County (part)		Bainbridge Township Benton Charter Township	
Tallmadge Township		Benton Harbor City	

House District 79 (Cont.)		House District 82 (Cont.)	
Coloma City Coloma Township Hagar Township Lincoln Township St. Joseph City St. Joseph Charter Township Watervliet City Watervliet Township		Grant Township Greenwood Township Ira Township Kenockee Township Lynn Township Marine City City Memphis City Mussey Township Riley Township Wales Township	
House District 80		Yale City	
Total Population (1990) Non-Hispanic Black Population Hispanic Population	88,976 6,714 2,635	House District 83	
Geographic Description Van Buren County Cass County (part)		Total Population (1990) . Non-Hispanic Black Population Hispanic Population	81,878 99 1,524
Dowagiac City La Grange Township Pokagon Township Silver Creek Township Volinia Township Wayne Township		Geographic Description Lapeer County (part) Arcadia Township Brown City City Burlington Township Burnside Township Deerfield Township	1,921
House District 81		Elba Township Goodland Township	
Total Population (1990) Non-Hispanic Black Population Hispanic Population Geographic Description St. Clair County (part) Burtchville Township China Township Clyde Township	90,246 2,763 1,861	Hadley Township Marathon Township Mayfield Township North Branch Township Oregon Township Rich Township Sanilac County	
East China Township Fort Gratiot Township		House District 84	
Kimball Township Marysville City Port Huron City		Total Population (1990)	90,449 489 1,522
Port Huron Township St. Clair City St. Clair Township		Geographic Description Huron County Tuscola County	
House District 82		House District 85	
Total Population (1990)	88,179 591 1,517	Total Population (1990)	77,894 100
Geographic Description Lapeer County (part) Almont Township Attica Township Dryden Township Imlay Township Imlay City City Lapeer City		Hispanic Population Geographic Description Shiawassee County Clinton County (part) Duplain Township Ovid Township Victor Township	1,222
Lapeer Township Metamora Township		House District 86	
St. Clair County (part) Algonac City Berlin Township Brockway Township		Total Population (1990) Non-Hispanic Black Population Hispanic Population	78,569 299 1,621
Casco Township Clay Township		Geographic Description Ionia County (part)	

Geographic Description Ionia County (part)

Danby Township Ionia City*

(all except Tract 306 [part] Block 104A)

Clay Township Columbus Township Cottrellville Township

Emmett Township

^{*} See District 87.

House District 86 (Cont.)

Ionia Township Lyons Township North Plains Township Orange Township Orleans Township

Portland City Portland Township

Ronald Township Sebewa Township

Clinton County (part)

Bath Township

Bengal Township

Bingham Township

Dallas Township

DeWitt City

DeWitt Township

Eagle Township

Essex Township

Greenbush Township

Lebanon Township Olive Township

Riley Township

St. Johns City

Watertown Township

Westphalia Township

House District 87

Total Population (1990)	78,271
Non-Hispanic Black Population	2,965
Hispanic Population	1,193

Geographic Description

Barry County Ionia County (part)

Belding City

Berlin Township

Boston Township

Campbell Township Easton Township

Keene Township Odessa Township

Otisco Township

Ionia City (part)*

Tract: 306 (part)

Block: 104A

House District 88

Total Population (1990)	90,509
Non-Hispanic Black Population	1,419
Hispanic Population	2,895

Geographic Description

Allegan County

House District 89

Total Population (1990)	90,747
Non-Hispanic Black Population	458
Hispanic Population	1.010

Geographic Description

Ottawa County (part)

Chester Township

Crockery Township

Polkton Township

Spring Lake Township

House District 89 (Cont.)

Allendale Township Coopersville City

Ferrysburg City

Georgetown Township

Grand Haven City Grand Haven Township

Wright Township

House District 90

Total Population (1990)	90,728
Non-Hispanic Black Population	465
Hispanic Population	6.887

Geographic Description

Ottawa County (part) Blendon Township

Holland City

Holland Township

Hudsonville City

Jamestown Township

Olive Township

Park Township Port Sheldon Township

Robinson Township

Zeeland City

Zeeland Township

House District 91

Total Population (1990)	79,765
Non-Hispanic Black Population	923
Hispanic Population	1,406

Geographic Description

Muskegon County (part)

Blue Lake Township Casnovia Township

Cedar Creek Township

Dalton Township

Egelston Township

Fruitland Township

Fruitport Township Holton Township

Montague City

Montague Township

Moorland Township

Norton Shores City

Ravenna Township

Roosevelt Park City

Sullivan Township

Whitehall City

Whitehall Township White River Township

House District 92

Total Population (1990)	79,218
Non-Hispanic Black Population	20,521
Hispanic Population	2.217

Geographic Description

Muskegon County (part)

Laketon Township

Muskegon City

Muskegon Township

Muskegon Heights City

North Muskegon City

^{*} This single census block is an island completely surrounded by Easton Township. It contains no population and is not a move or a split.

House District 93		House District 96 (Cont.)	
Total Population (1990) Non-Hispanic Black Population Hispanic Population Geographic Description	89,115 1,265 2,213	Geographic Description Saginaw County (part) Blumfield Township Carrollton Township	
Montcalm County Gratiot (part) Alma City Aracada Township Bethany Township Elba Township Emerson Township Fulton Township Hamilton Township Ithaca City Lafayette Township Newark Township New Haven Township		Kochville Township Saginaw Township Zilwaukee City Zilwaukee Township Bay County (part) Essexville City Frankenlust Township Hampton Township Merritt Township Monitor Township Portsmouth Township	
North Shade Township North Star Township		House District 97	
Pine River Township St. Louis City Seville Township		Total Population (1990) Non-Hispanic Black Population Hispanic Population	80,894 1,031 2,938
Sumner Township Washington Township		Geographic Description Bay County (part) Auburn City	
House District 94	90 (50	Bangor Township Bay City City	
Total Population (1990) Non-Hispanic Black Population Hispanic Population	80,658 2,003 2,799	Beaver Township Fraser Township Garfield Township	
Geographic Description Saginaw County (part) Albee Township Birch Run Township Brant Township Bridgeport Township Chapin Township Frankenmuth City Frankenmuth Township		Gibson Township Kawkawlin Township Midland City Mount Forest Township Pinconning City Pinconning Township Williams Township	
Fremont Township James Township Jonesfield Township		House District 98	
Lakefield Township Marion Township Richland Township		Total Population (1990)	78,577 706 1,177
St. Charles Township Spaulding Township Swan Creek Township Taymouth Township Thomas Township Tittabawassee Township		Geographic Description Midland County Gratiot County (part) Wheeler Township	
Brady Township Chesaning Township		House District 99	
Maple Grove Township		Total Population (1990) Non-Hispanic Black Population Hispanic Population	79,576 677 846
House District 95 Total Population (1990)	80,412	Geographic Description	
Non-Hispanic Black Population	32,760 8,319	Clare County Isabella County	
Geographic Description Saginaw County (part)		House District 100	
Buena Vista Charter Township Saginaw City		Total Population (1990) Non-Hispanic Black Population Hispanic Population	84,093 2,575 1,417
House District 96	01.705	Geographic Description	
Total Population (1990) Non-Hispanic Black Population Hispanic Population	81,705 1,707 2,624	Lake County Mecosta County Newaygo County	

House District 101	
Total Domulation (1000)	

Total Population (1990)	81,456
Non-Hispanic Black Population	294
Hispanic Population	2,241

Geographic Description

Benzie County Manistee County Mason County Oceana County

House District 102

Total Population (1990)	78,429
Non-Hispanic Black Population	127
Hispanic Population	457

Geographic Description

Missaukee County Osceola County Roscommon County Wexford County

House District 103

Total Population (1990)	85,717
Non-Hispanic Black Population	667
Hispanic Population	764

Geographic Description

Arenac County Gladwin County Iosco County Ogemaw County

House District 104

Total Population (1990)	80,800
Non-Hispanic Black Population	267
Hispanic Population	691

Geographic Description

Grand Traverse County Leelanau County

House District 105

Total Population (1990)	88,822
Non-Hispanic Black Population	337
Hispanic Population	494

Geographic Description

Alcona County Antrim County Crawford County Kalkaska County Montmorency County Oscoda County Otsego County

House District 106

Total Population (1990)	87,214
Non-Hispanic Black Population	78
Hispanic Population	374
0 11 5 1 4	

Geographic Description

Alpena County Charlevoix County Cheboygan County Presque Isle County

House District 107

Total Population (1990)	84,383
Non-Hispanic Black Population	2,302
Hispanic Population	488

Geographic Description

Emmet County Luce County Mackinac County Schoolcraft County Chippewa County

House District 108

Total Population (1990)	89,531
Non-Hispanic Black Population	45
Hispanic Population	311
_	

Geographic Description

Delta County Dickinson County Menominee County

House District 109

Total Population (1990)	79,859
Non-Hispanic Black Population	1,360
Hispanic Population	609

Geographic Description

Alger County Marquette County

House District 110

Total Population (1990)	85,182
Non-Hispanic Black Population	453
Hispanic Population	373

Geographic Description

Baraga County Gogebic County Houghton County Iron County Keweenaw County Ontonagon County

NOTE: Following the 1990 federal decennial census, the Michigan Legislature attempted to enact a plan reapportioning itself, but these efforts failed. In 1991, a lawsuit was filed in Iosco Circuit Court (Neff v Secretary of State) requesting the circuit judge to

but these efforts failed. In 1991, a lawsuit was filed in losco Circuit Court (Neff v Secretary of State) requesting the circuit judge to declare the 1982 apportionment and districting plan invalid due to changes in population, to enjoin elections under the 1982 plan, and to undertake a new and proper apportionment of the legislature. Thereafter, Governor John M. Engler asked the Michigan Supreme Court to authorize the circuit judge to certify questions that would aid in apportioning the legislature.

At about the same time, an original action was filed in the Michigan Supreme Court invoking its jurisdiction under Const 1963, art 4. In view of the pendency of the new matter, the supreme court dismissed the losco Circuit Court case. In re Apportionment of the State Legislature—1992, 439 Mich 1203 (1991).

On December 9, 1991, the Michigan Supreme Court entered an order appointing three special masters and directed them to submit an apportionment and districting plan to the court if the legislature and the governor did not enact one by January 15, 1992. (Although bills to reapportion the legislature were introduced, no plan was enacted into law before the deadline.) The Panel of Special Masters began evaluating plans that had been submitted by several sources, including the major political parties, according to criteria outlined in the court's 1982 reapportionment decision and the Voting Rights Act of 1965, as amended. After conducting several days of hearings in late January, the panel determined that none of the plans submitted to them was satisfactory and proceeded to draw their own plan. On February 20, 1992, the special masters submitted their reapportionment plan for the state legislature to the supreme court accompanied by the following report:

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL MASTERS ON LEGISLATIVE REAPPORTIONMENT

By order of December 9, 1991, the Supreme Court appointed Judges Hood, Lesinski and Peterson (subsequently replaced by Judge Porter) as the Panel of Special Masters to submit a plan for the reapportionment of the Michigan Legislature in the event that the legislature did not enact such a plan by January 15, 1992. The order directed the panel as follows:

4. Except as otherwise required by constitution or by law, the criteria to be employed in adopting a plan are those set forth in *In re Apportionment of State Legislature*—1982, 413 Mich 96, at pp 141-142. However, we intimate no opinion with respect to the range of allowable population divergence (see *Maban* v *Howell*, 410 US 315 [1973] and *Brown* v Thompson, 462 US 835 [1983]), or with respect to the application of the Voting Rights Act (see Thornburg v Gingles, 478 US 30 [1986])

Pursuant to said order the panel met and established a schedule of events to culminate in the submission of a plan to the Court by February 15, 1992.

Pursuant to that schedule, the panel held evidentiary hearings on January 27, 28 and 29, 1992, and considered prehearing and posthearing briefs submitted by the parties and by intervening parties amicus curiae. The panel heard testimony regarding the creation of the Neff and Hoffman plans and testimony of experts and other witnesses presented at the hearings. It allowed opening

creation of the Nerf and Horman plans and testimony of experies and other witnesses presented at the hearings. It allowed opening statements by intervenors Kelly and Powers, as well as the submission of certain questions to witnesses on behalf of intervenor Senator Kelly. In evaluating the plans submitted, the panel was guided by the 1982 Supreme Court reapportionment decision and criteria found therein. The panel also considered the implications of the Voting Rights Act, as amended in 1982 (VRA).

The panel's review of the plans and the matter submitted to it has led it to the conclusion that none of the plans submitted is acceptable because they either fail to comply with the 1982 criteria or do so only facially. Viewed under the totality of the circumstances, the panel found a disregard of some specific criteria, such as community of interest or compactness. A review of the primary party's plans, for example, reveal several instances of districts whose configuration would challenge both the candidates and the voters to understand where their district lies.

In view of the findings of the panel that no one plan met the court's criteria, the panel followed paragraph 5 of the December 9, 1991, order, and submits to the Court a reapportionment plan which it has drafted. The panel did not consider political partisanship in any way and its plan is "incumbent neutral," in that no attempt whatsoever was made to determine what effect the redrawn

districts might have on existing officeholders. The panel concluded that these concepts, as well as "political fairness," which might quite properly be considered in legislatively-drafted plans should not be considered by nonpartisan masters.

All the parties, on the whole, agreed that the plan was to be developed employing the criteria set forth in *In re Apportionment of State Legislature*—1982, 413 Mich 96 (1982) (hereafter "1982") and the requirements under the federal constitution regarding allowable population divergences between districts and commitment to not diluting the ability of minority groups to participate in the electoral process, as guaranteed by the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments. It was the actual application of these principles

to a specific plan which the parties could not agree upon.

There is also no dispute regarding the number of house and senate seats to be assigned, the population totals to be employed, or the use of 16.4% as the allowable population divergence (the percentage used in the 1982 apportionment.)

The one thing that became clear as this panel reviewed the submittals and set about its own task, was that there should be no absolute hierarchy of criteria. While counties may be the building blocks of our apportionment system (1982, 413 Mich at 125), county lines were "broken" when necessary to achieve acceptable population divergence was employed to maintain minority electorial participation already realized; VRA interests were recognized and followed, but not to the exclusion of concerns of integrity of existing boundary lines, communities of interest, compactness and contiguity.

I. The 1982 Criteria

Pursuant to correspondence from this panel to the Michigan Supreme Court in January, 1992, the panel employed the criteria set forth in 1982 at pages 141-142 and 154-156. Review of the 154-156 criteria indicates that it both restates the criteria in the Supreme Court's original opinion and order in 1982, and set forth guidance for the types of practical problems which occur, as this panel became well aware, in applying those criteria. In general, employment of the criteria meant that this panel strove to maintain existing county, city and township lines; that there was a commitment to compact and contiguous districts, that where lines had to be broken that it was done so as to disturb as little as possible the existing community of interest; and that the panel employ the minimal number of breaks feasible to attain all the goals involved in this process, such as equal population distribution and VRA concerns.

Cases reviewing equal population and VRA claims recognize the legitimacy of these same state criteria of compactness, integrity of existing political subdivisions and contiguity. See *Martin v Mabus*, 700 F Supp 327, 334-35 (SD Miss 1988). Employment of these criteria can act as a means of avoiding gerrymandering, *Reynolds v Sims*, 377 US 533, 581; 12 L Ed 2d 506; 84 S Ct 1367 (1963), as well as a means of assuring effective representation within an existing community of interest. *Reynolds* at 580-581; *Dillard v Baldwin County*, 686 F Supp 1459 (MD Ala 1988). An unusually shaped district can signal a problem with how the district is drawn. *Karchery Daggett*, 462 US 725, 755; 102 S Ct 2653, 2672 (1983). While this panel did not mechanically apply any criteria, it districts the state of the control of t it did strive to employ the 1982 criteria in a consistent and thoughtful manner.

Because this panel was creating its own plan, it did not consider whether its plan had the smallest number of breaks as compared to any other plan. Even if that had been a concern, obviously a rule that the smallest number of breaks indicates the most acceptable plan could not be absolutely or mechanically applied; it could only be employed where the plans were equal in achieving the overall goals of reapportionment.

The panel does note that the plan which it has drafted breaks fewer county lines than any plan submitted by the primary parties except the Neff 'overlay' plan, which admittedly has one fewer county line break than the panel's plan. We reject that plan, however, because we feel that the configuration of its districts is unreasonable and does undue violence to the corollary concepts of compactness and community interest.

II. Equal Population

The rule regarding acceptable population divergence between districts is basically the same since 1982. Brown v Thompson 462 US 835; 77 L Ed 2d 214; 103 S Ct 2690 (1983), made it clear that a divergence of greater than 10% puts a burden on the state to justify the deviation, but that a divergence in the range of 16% could be acceptable where the situation of the state required. The practicalities of drawing districts in Michigan, with both populous urban areas and larger rural areas, as well as VRA concerns, made continued recognition of a 16.4% divergence acceptable to this panel. While, as required by the federal constitution, our goal was a good faith effort to create districts as nearly equal in population as practicable (Reynolds, supra, at 577), the 16.4% divergence allowed this panel some leeway in dealing with the practicalities of reapportionment.

First, it should be recognized that there is no VRA claim before this panel. There are two districts which come under the VRA section 5 preclearance requirement, but it was this panel's understanding that those districts, in practical matters, required no special consideration of this panel.

Second, what is really before this panel are concerns for complying with the Fifteenth Amendment of the federal constitution. The VRA is a federal statutory tool for enforcing the Fifteenth Amendment, *Chisom v Roebmer*, 111 S Ct 2354, 2357 (1991). The cases applying the Act were useful for elucidating instances and remedies which can be of concern in preserving or assuring minority voting rights.

While cases and commentary concerning the VRA were instructive, they proved of limited practical value to this panel. The While cases and commentary concerning the VRA were instructive, they proved of limited practical value to this panel. I ne numerous lawsuits which have been brought under the VRA are typically brought by members of a protected group, involve extensive fact-finding at the trial level, and concern issues — such as the viability of multi-member districts — which are not before this panel. Furthermore, there are present uncertainties concerning the scope and intent of the Act which are best resolved by the courts. (For example, compare Armour v State of Obio, 775 F Supp 1044 (ND Ohio 1991) and Hastert v State Bd of Elections, 777 F Supp 634, 651-655 (ND III, 1991), on the creation of "influence districts.") While each party stated that its plan complied with the VRA, there was no agreement on what were the practical criteria to be applied. In general, the cases provide few specific directives which apply to our present nonadversarial situation where those assigned the task of reapportionment seek to assure before-the-first that unsubsets of a subscript received in the relative to proceed the or the structure of their behavior. fact that members of a minority group can both participate in the political process and elect legislators of their choice.

The recently released opinion of the California Supreme Court, adopting a reapportionment plan prepared at its direction by a panel of special masters, provided some reassurance regarding this panel's understanding and approach to the VRA. For all

practical purposes in Wilson, the VRA criteria condensed to identification and preservation of functionally, geographically compact minority groups of sufficient voting strength to constitute a majority in a single-member district and the avoidance of unnecessary fragmentation and undue concentration or packing. Wilson v March Fong Eu (No. S022855, filed Jan 27, 1992, slip op pp 7-8.) The masters declined to speculate as to evidence regarding voting patterns or socioeconomic data, or to identify and resolve open legal questions concerning the interpretation or application of the VRA. They applied 1990 federal census data and a "functional" view and "practical" evaluation of the "past and present reality" as their primary tools in drawing districts. Masters Report, Appendix I, to

Wilson, pp 9, 14-18.

Similarly, this panel relied on the 1990 census figures rather than any of the approaches advocated by the parties' experts for determining minority voting strength in a district. We recognized the recurring directive from Section 2 of the VRA: that consideration of whether there has been a denial or abridgement of voting rights depends on the totality of the circumstances. See 42 USC 1973(b) and *Thornburg* v. *Gingles*, 478 US 42, 43-46; 106 S Ct 2752, 2762-2764, 92 L Ed 2d 25 (1986). For this panel, that included the existing reality of minority enough stricts in Wayne County and existing representation of minority groups minority group representatives. The simple identification of areas with 60-65% minority population did not mean that the panel's

minority group representatives. The simple identification of areas with 60-05% minority population due not mean that the panets task was done. Rather, we also considered a practical evaluation of the past and present reality of the districts in question. Thornburg, 478 US at 45; Whitev Regester, 412 US 755, 769-770 (1972); Garzav County of Los Angeles, 918 F2d 763, 770 (CA 9, 1990). This panel recognized concerns regarding the "fracturing" and "packing" of minority populations, Ketchum v Byrne, 740 F 2d 1398, 1408 notes 7 and 8 (CA 7, 1984), and the avoidance of "retrogression." Id, at 1402, note 2. It was concern with fracturing that resulted in the preservation of the Hispanic population concentration in Southwest Detroit, rather than the division called for in the resulted in the preservation of the Hispanic population concentration in Southwest Detroit, rather than the division called for in the Meff plan. However, not all members of a minority group must reside in a minority-majority district. See Campos v City of Baytoun, 840 F 2d 1240, 1244 (CA 5, 1988). As to packing, where residency patterns — rather than the manipulation of district lines — result in a district with a minority population of greater than 80%, that does not automatically defeat that district on the basis of "packing." See Rybicki v State Board of Elections, 574 F Supp 1147, 1152 (ND Ill. 1983). Where changes in population result in a decrease in the absolute number of minority group representatives, that decrease does not automatically defeat the resulting district on the basis of "retrogression." See Ketchum, 740 F 2d at 1402, n 2.

The panel concludes that it has adopted a plan in compliance with the court's directives, and submits the same herewith. County, township and city line breaks are set forth in detail in Exhibits A. & B.

On April 1, 1992, the Supreme Court entered an order approving, with modifications, the apportionment plan presented by the masters. The court noted that "Illhe apportionment plan of the masters has been drawn in accordance with the criteria stated in *In re Apportionment of State Legislature*—1982, 413 Mich 96, 141-142, 154-156; 321 NW2d 565 (1982), *reb den* 413 Mich 149; 321 NW2d 585 (1982), *app dis'd sub nom Kleiner v Sanderson*, 459 US 909; 103 S Ct 201; 74 L Ed 2d 161 (1982). The masters also examined \$2 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, as amended in 1982 (VRA), 42 USC 1973. After the parties stipulated that, as in 1982, 16.4 percentage points was the maximum allowable population divergence, the masters ruled that they would consider no plan

with greater divergence than 16.4 percentage points.

Some who commented on the report of the masters expressed concerns regarding the population divergence found in the masters' plan. In 1982, we directed that the divergence between the largest and smallest districts could not exceed 16.4 percentage points. Mahan v Howell, 410 US 315; 93 S Ct 979; 35 L Ed 2d 320 (1973).

The plan developed by the masters approaches, but does not exceed, that limit. We remain persuaded that a population divergence of 16.4 percentage points is constitutional in light of the "substantial and legitimate state concerns" which underlie this apportionment. *Brown* v *Thomson*, 462 US 835; 103 S Ct 2690; 77 L Ed 2d 214 (1983). These valid state concerns focus on the importance of honoring jurisdictional lines, in order to foster effective representative government. We are persuaded that the objectives of preserving county and municipal boundaries, and of minimizing shifts of municipalities and voters, justify the population divergence that is present in the masters' plan.

Others have suggested that the masters' plan would violate the VRA, particularly with regard to the apportionment of Wayne County. This statute is violated if "the political processes leading to nomination or election in the State or political subdivision are not equally open to participation by members of a class of citizens protected by [the VRA] in that its members have less opportunity than other members of the electorate to participate in the political process and to elect representatives of their choice. 42 USC 1973(b). *Thomburg v Gingles*, 478 US 30, 43-46; 106 S Ct 2752; 92 L Ed 2d 25 (1986) teaches that one makes this determination through an examination of the "totality of circumstances".

We are persuaded, however, that the masters did consider the totality of circumstances and that they were appropriately concerned with recognition of VRA interests. To that end, in adopting today's reapportionment plan, we have accepted for the most part the masters' plan while reconfiguring House Districts 4, 5, 11, 13 and 14 in order to provide a better racial balance throughout these districts.²

With the modifications noted in the preceding paragraph, we adopt the reapportionment plan drawn by the masters. It is hereby ordered and the Secretary of State is directed to publish as provided by law and hold legislative elections in accordance with the reapportionment plan hereby approved.

This Court retains no further jurisdiction.
Subsequently, a lawsuit was filed in Federal District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, arguing that the apportionment and districting plan for the Michigan Senate and House of Representatives adopted by the Supreme Court in its April 1 order violated the federal Voting Rights Act. On June 15, 1992, the Michigan Supreme Court issued a 48-page unanimous memorandum opinion "to communicate the basis our decision [in the apportionment case] and, in the spirit of comity, to assist the federal court in the suit filed in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan." In re Apportionment of State Legislature— 1992, 439 Mich 715 (1992). A three-member panel of the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan ruled on July 14, 1994, that the legislative reapportionment plan adopted by the Michigan Supreme Court on April 1, 1992, was not racially discriminatory and did not have to be rewritten. *NAACP* v *Secretary of State* (Docket No. 92-CV-72696-DT).

²The following table reflects percentage of minority population in the plan proposed by the masters and that adopted by the Court in these House districts.

District	Masters' plan	Plan as adopt
4	89.89%	85.73%
5	65.41%	70.02%
11	95.80%	79.71%
13	57.10%	71.95%
14	67.04%	68.17%

¹The panel notes that one of its county breaks occurred due to the necessity of breaking Lenawee County, which has a population of 91,476, only 45 persons more than the maximum allowable for the county to have its own representative in the house. The panel suggests that the Court may consider finding this divergence de minimis, which would eliminate this county break. See Brown v Thompson, 462 US 835; 77 L Ed 2d 214; 103 S Ct 2690 (1983). The panel also notes that it can eliminate one additional county line break, but would then present some districts with bizarre configurations such as those described.